I think we should talk about this briefly. The problem arises from two sources. One is the

appearance of threat (which I don't personally object to, but others do). The second, and to my mind more serious, problem is that the goals of the public library of science go beyond the goals of PubMed Central. For instance, you would ask that publishers relinquish all copyright, whereas PMC does not. This

## Patrick O. Brown, 1/10/01 8:49 AM -0800, discussion of changes in open letter

is a major difference for the publishers. Thus, many people have told me they would support PMC, but would not sign your pledge. These are "votes" that are very important for PMC, but are currently geting lost. I erred in my PNAS editorial in not explicitly stating the differences and already I have been accused of subterfuge and being misleading (obviously not I want). I think I need to address this explicitly in the Nature/Science piece.

If your pledge were to change, then I agree you must contact everyone but I don't see that as a particular problem. However, what you might change is something we should discuss.

Rich